

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/770,358	THUSOO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Baoquoc N To	2172	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Baoquoc N To. (3) ____.
- (2) Janet Chen. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 22 March 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: ____.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant representative's Janet calls the office regarding to the final office action dated on 02/02/04. The examiner agrees with applicant representative's Janet that there is an error in the final office action. The office issues another office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

DETAILED ACTION

1. After carefully reviewing the remark application remarks, the Office withdraws the Finality of the Office action dated on 02/02/04. The Office regrets any inconveniences due to the applicants.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application and claims 17-32 are added on amendment filed on 11/13/03.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 9 and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochrane et al. (US. Patent No. 6,581,205).

Regarding on claims 1 and 17, Cochrane teaches a method for applying a row from a source table to a destination table, the method comprising:

Selecting first column from a source table (column A) (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Selecting a second column from a destination table (MV) (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Performing an outer join (outer join) operation on the source table and the destination table using the first and second columns (col. 7, lines 1-6);

Cochrane does not explicitly teach updating each row in the destination table with a row from the result of the outer join operation containing a matching element in the first and second columns; and inserting into the destination table each row from the result set of the outer join operation with a non-matching element in the first and second columns. Cochrane teaches, "to determine an insert or update is required, a DELTA-T table may be recreated containing two rows; one to delete group A2 and the other to insert/update group A3" (col. 5, lines 57-60). In addition, Cochrane teaches "insert returns any non-matching groups, whereas the second operation, the update, return all matching groups. These two operations can be combine together into an outer join, which return both matching and non-matching group" (col. 6, lines 22-67). This teaches the results of the outer-join operations are the updating all matching and inserting any non-matching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the updating the matching and inserting all non-matching into the destination table as taught by Cochrane as the result of the outer-join in order to maintain the consistency between the tables.

Regarding on claims 2 and 18, Cochrane teaches the combining the rows in the source table that the first column has unique element in each row (col. 5, lines 50-67).

Art Unit: 2172

Regarding on claims 3 and 19, Cochrane teaches the combining step further comprises:

Sorting the rows in the source table based on the element in the first column (col. 5, lines 55-67; and

Creating a groups of rows, wherein each row in the group of rows contains a matching element in the first column (col. 5, lines 55-67);

Combining the group of rows into a single row (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 4 and 20, Cochrane teaches the outer join operation uses an equal comparison operator for a comparison statement (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 5 and 21, Cochrane teaches a single query language statement to insert a new row or update an existing row in database table, the statement implementing a process comprising the steps of:

Selecting from a source table a first column comprising a plurality of elements (column A) (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Selecting from a destination table a second column comprising a plurality of elements (MV) (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Determining a set of matching rows based upon the success of a comparison operation on an element in the first column and an element in the second column (col. 5, lines 64-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8);

Determining a set of non-matching rows based upon the failure of a comparison operation on the first column element and the second column element (col. 5, lines 64-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8);

Cochrane does not explicitly teach updating the destination table with the set of matching rows; and inserting into the destination table the set of non-matching rows. Cochrane teaches, "to determine an insert or update is required, a DELTA-T table may be recreated containing two rows; one to delete group A2 and the other to insert/update group A3" (col. 5, lines 57-60). In addition, Cochrane teaches "insert returns any non-matching groups, whereas the second operation, the update, return all matching groups. These two operations can be combine together into an outer join, which return both matching and non-matching group" (col. 6, lines 22-67). This teaches the results of the outer-join operations are the updating all matching and inserting any non-matching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the updating the matching and inserting all non-matching into the destination table as taught by Cochrane as the result of the outer-join in order to maintain the consistency between the tables.

Regarding on claims 6 and 22, Cochrane teaches combining the rows in the source table, wherein the resulting source table has a unique element in each row of the first column (col. 5, lines 50-67).

Regarding on claims 7 and 23, Cochrane teaches the combining step further comprises:

Sorting the rows in the source table based on the element in the first column (col. 5, lines 50-67); and

Creating a group of rows, wherein each row in the group of rows contains a matching element in the first column (col. 5, lines 50-67);

Combining the group of rows into a single row (col. 5, lines 50-67).

Regarding on claims 8 and 24, Cochrane teaches the comparison operation uses an equal comparison operator (col. 5, lines 50-67).

Regarding on claims 9 and 25, Cochrane teaches a method for upserting a source table with a destination table in a single query language, the method comprising:

Selecting from a source table a first column comprising a plurality of elements (column A) (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Selecting from a destination table a second column comprising a plurality of elements (MV) (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Cochrane does not explicitly teach updating a row in the destination table with a row from the source table upon the success of a comparison operation on an element in the first column of the row from the source table and an element in the second column of the row from the destination table; and inserting a row from the source table into the destination table upon the failure of a comparison operation on an element in the first column of the row from the source table and an element in the second column of the row from the destination table. Cochrane teaches, "to determine an insert or update is required, a DELTA-T table may be recreated containing two rows; one to delete group A2 and the other to insert/update group A3" (col. 5, lines 57-60). In addition, Cochrane teaches "insert returns any non-matching groups, whereas the second operation, the update, return all matching groups. These two operations can be combine together into an outer join, which return both matching and non-matching group" (col. 6, lines 22-67).

This teaches the results of the outer-join operations are the updating all matching (success) and inserting any non-matching (failure). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the updating the matching and inserting all non-matching into the destination table as taught by Cochrane as the result of the outer-join in order to maintain the consistency between the tables.

Regarding on claims 10 and 26, Cochrane teaches combining the rows in the source table, wherein the resulting source table has a unique element in each row of the first column (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 11 and 27, Cochrane teaches the combining the step further comprises:

Sorting the rows in the source table based on the element in the first column (col. 5, lines 55-67); and

Creating a group of rows, wherein each row in the group of rows contains a matching element in the first column (col. 5, lines 55-67);

Combining the group of rows into a single row (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 12 and 28, Cochrane teaches the comparison operation uses an equal comparison operator (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 13 and 29, Cochrane teaches a computer implemented method for aggregating data in a database, comprising:

Parsing from a command line, a command, a source table (column A), a destination table (MV), a source key, and a destination key (col. 6, lines 65-67);

Comparing the source key in each row of the source table with the destination key in each row of the destination table (col. 5, lines 64-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8);

Determining a set of update rows based upon the success of a comparison operation performed on the source key and the destination key (col. 5, lines 64-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8);

Determining a set of insert rows based upon the failure of a comparison operation performed on the source key and the destination key (record of rows) col. 5, lines 64-67 to col. 6, lines 1-8);

Cochrane does not explicitly teach updating the destination table with the set of update row; and inserting into the destination table with the set of insert rows.

Cochrane teaches, "to determine an insert or update is required, a DELTA-T table may be recreated containing two rows; one to delete group A2 and the other to insert/update group A3" (col. 5, lines 57-60). In addition, Cochrane teaches "insert returns any non-matching groups, whereas the second operation, the update, return all matching groups. These two operations can be combine together into an outer join, which return both matching and non-matching group" (col. 6, lines 22-67). This teaches the results from the comparison process are the updating all matching and inserting any non-matching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the updating the matching and inserting all non-matching into the destination table as taught by Cochrane as the result of the outer-join in order to maintain the consistency between the tables.

Regarding on claims 14 and 30, Cochrane teaches combining the rows in the source table, wherein the resulting source table has a unique source key in each row of the source table (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 15 and 31, Cochrane teaches sorting the rows in the source table based on the source key (col. 5, lines 55-67); and

Creating a group of rows, wherein each row in the group of rows contain a matching element in the source key (col. 5, lines 55-67);

Combining the group of rows into a single row (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Regarding on claims 16 and 32, Cochrane teaches the comparison operation uses an equal comparison operator (col. 5, lines 55-67).

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is (703) 305-1949 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at (703) 305-9790.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

Art Unit: 2172

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II


2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA 22202

Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Baoquoc N. To

March 31, 2004



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER